AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

PREP Program; Alternate Certification (19, 20, 21)

Division: Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development

Department: School of Education

Prepared by: Jodi Shirley   **Date: June 19, 2020**
Confirmed by GCEHD Assessment Coordinator Susan Kahn

Approved by: Kimberly McAlister   **Date: July 19, 2020**

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission.
The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is committed to working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge to Northwestern students through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. Through the School of Education and Departments of Health and Human Performance, Military Science, Psychology, and Social Work, the College produces knowledgeable, inspired, and innovative graduates ready for lifelong learning who contribute to the communities in which they reside and professions they serve. Additionally, the GCEHD is dedicated to the communities served by the Marie Shaw Dunn Child Development Center, NSU Elementary Laboratory School, NSU Middle Laboratory School, and the NSU Child and Family Network to assist children and their families related to learning and development.

School of Education Mission. The School of Education offers exemplary programs that prepare candidates for career success in a variety of professional roles and settings. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive models in their communities and organizations. This mission is fulfilled through academic programs based on theory, research, and best practice. Further, all graduates learn to value and work with diverse populations and to incorporate technologies that enrich learning and
professional endeavors.

Methodology:
The assessment process for the PREP program includes:

(1) Data from assessment tools are collected and returned to the program coordinator.
(2) Data will be analyzed to determine student learning and whether students have met measurable outcomes.

(3)   Results are shared with program faculty and discussed.
(4)   The program coordinator, in consultation with program faculty, will determine proposed changes to instruction or assessment tools for the next assessment period.

Student Learning Outcomes:

SLO 1.
Course Map: required before certification

● Candidates take the Praxis PLT upon completion of PREP courses prior to certification.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge. (Praxis PLT exam)	100% of candidates will demonstrate knowledge of best teaching practices relating to their area of certification on a standardized exam

Measure 1.1.
(Direct-Knowledge)
Demonstrate discipline-specific knowledge of teaching pedagogy

SLO 1 is addressed with the Praxis PLT exam (Practices of Learning and Teaching), which is nationally normed. The Praxis exams demonstrate knowledge and skill in pedagogy and instruction. This assessment is nationally validated and reliable. Candidates must meet or exceed state established minimum scaled scores as mandated by the Louisiana State Department of Education. The required minimum passing scaled scores are as follows: Elementary test #5622 score is 160, Middle school test #5623 score is 160, Secondary school test # 5624 score is 157. The reported scaled scores range from 100-200.

Finding. Target was Not Met.

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Not Met
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target Not Met
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target Met

Analysis.

In AC 2018-2019, the target was not met. In AC 2018-2019, 87.5% (7 out of 8) of candidates met or exceeded the benchmark. One candidate did not attempt the

exam. Data from the PLT exams indicated mean scaled scores of 175 out of 200, on PLT Elementary test #5622, scaled score of 114 out of 200 on PLT Middle School #5623, and 160 out of 200 scaled scores on PLT Secondary School #5624.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty provided candidates with information regarding the Learning Express Library, an online database provided through the library system as a resource tool for Praxis preparation. Concepts that are assessed on the Praxis PLT are embedded in the PREP courses. These changes had the potential to have a direct impact on the student's ability to demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge.

Despite these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was not met. In AC 2019-2020, an incomplete data set was available due to campus and school closures according to federal and state stay-at-home orders due to the coronavirus pandemic.

In AC 2019-2020, analysis of the incomplete data reveal that 40% (2 out of 5) of candidates attempted the exam and met the benchmark. Data from the PLT exams indicate scaled scores of 177 on the Elementary PLT #5622 and 168 on the Secondary PLT #5624. Conclusions cannot be determined based on the limited data available for this SLO. The majority of candidates did not have the opportunity to take the Praxis PLT during the later part of the Spring 2020 semester. Based on the limited data, the Praxis score report revealed that on the Elementary PLT, the candidate's scores fell with the average ranges in the areas of: students as learners, assessment, professional development leadership and community, and analysis of instructional scenarios. The candidate scored below the average performance range of 13-16 (raw points) in the category of instructional process with a raw score of 11. The secondary candidate scored within the average performance ranges in the areas of students as learners, instructional process, assessment, professional development leadership and community. The secondary candidate scored well below the average performance range of 7-12 in the area of analysis of instructional scenarios with a raw score of 5.

Decision, action or recommendation.

In AC 2019-2020, the target was not met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will partner with the NSU Academic Success Center and the School of Education to coordinate resources for candidates who are preparing for Praxis exams. The partnership will provide candidates with options for support including small group study sessions, individual tutors, and online resources. Instructors for the PREP courses in the summer semester (EDUC 5650/5670, EDUC 5660/5680, and EPSY 5480) will provide candidates with specific information regarding the concepts testing on the PLT through the document published by ETS/Praxis, *The Study*

Companion. This resource includes: an overview of the test, a template study plan, study topics, practice questions and explanations of correct answers and links to detailed information related to the test. Instructors will provide candidates with information regarding the Learning Express Library resource for individual use in preparing for the PLT in their area.

These changes will improve the student's ability to demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 2

Course Map: PREP Internship courses

SLO 2 is assessed through a teaching evaluation form. Candidates apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice during their Internship semesters.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice	100% of candidates will met the target of 2 out of 3 on a teaching evaluation instrument to assess content, pedagogical knowledge, and skills in professional practice.

Measure 2.1. (Direct-Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)

SLO 2 is assessed via a Teacher Candidate Observation form in EDUC 5410 (elementary), EDUC 5420(middle), and EDUC 5430(secondary) by a University supervisor, a mentor teacher, and a school principal. These courses are taken during the internship portion of the PREP program prescription of study. The Teacher Candidate Observation Form is comprised of items extracted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching instrument. The rating scale was adjusted to reflect course grading requirements, but the criteria and indicators were not adjusted from the Framework. The assessment provides evidence for meeting the state identified standards because it is aligned with InTASC standards, and content validity was established for the instrument. Steps were taken to assure Quality of the assessment/evidence. A panel of 11 P-12 clinicians viewed two 20-minute teaching vignettes and conducted independent evaluations of the teaching performance using this tool. Analyses were conducted using the Lawshe Content Validity Ration (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.

The goal is for at least 80% of candidates to score a "2" on the rubric. To determine criteria for success,
• CVR mean = -.03 with CVR (Critical, 11) = .59 and no single item meeting critical value of .59.
• ICC = .59. ICC of .4 - .59 reflects "fair" inter-rater agreement, and .6 is considered

"good."

Findings: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Met. 100% of candidates met target.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target Met**.** 100% of candidates met target.
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target Met. 100% of candidates met target.

Analysis.

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019 university supervisors who evaluated the PREP candidates using the Teacher Candidate Observation form provided suggestions for improvement in the areas of creating an environment of respect and rapport, managing classroom procedures, and using questioning and discussion techniques. If needed, these components were indicated as *"area for improvement"* on the observation instrument. These areas were then included in a follow-up evaluation for indicators of improvement. As a result, in AC 2018-2019, 100% of candidates met benchmark and scored "Meets Expectations" or "Target" of the required benchmark of the 3-point scale rubric. The mean evaluation score from elementary PREP candidates was 3.0, for middle school PREP candidates a mean score of 2.64, and for secondary PREP candidates a mean score of 2.93. Overall weaknesses included the categories of "Adjusts lesson when appropriate" and "Makes appropriate decisions". Many strengths were indicated with a score of 3 out of a possible 3 on the rubric.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. In accordance with the plan of action from AC 2018-2019, in AC 2019-2020 the PREP faculty examined the new teacher competencies to provide opportunities to model ways to adjust lessons and make appropriate decisions. The Director of Clinical Experiences and PREP faculty examined the possible options for field experiences. Program instructors included the professional videos through Atlas as a valuable opportunity for candidates to connect classroom experiences to the coursework. Faculty selected videos that modeled best practices in *making lesson adjustments* for use in online courses. In addition to classroom videos, Atlas provided teacher commentary and supporting documents that explained the reasoning for the decisions made by the teacher when planning and executing the lessons. This information provided background and support information to enhance the videos. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met, though data reported reflects data available for Fall 2019 only. In AC 2019-2020, data were not available for Spring 2020 due to campus and school closures according to federal and state stay-at-home orders due to the coronavirus pandemic.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

In AC 2019-2020, the mean score on the teaching evaluation instrument for the Elementary candidate for all indicators was 2.56 on a 3-point scale. The lowest score being 2.25 in the area of *managing classroom procedures.* The mean score on the teaching evaluation instrument for Middle school was 2.60. The lowest score being 1.71 in the area of *using questioning and discussion techniques.* Two other areas of weakness for Middle School candidates were *demonstrating knowledge of resources* with a mean score of 1.85 and *designing coherent instruction,* also with a mean score of 1.85. The mean score for Secondary candidates for all indicators was 2.39

Decision, action or recommendation.

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty in the PREP program for elementary candidates will focus on ways to enhance students' knowledge of managing classroom procedures through modeling examples in virtual field experiences. Faculty in the Middle/Secondary levels will focus on ways to enhance students' knowledge in the area of using questioning and discussion techniques. Faculty will support student learning in this area by adding emphasis on application of Bloom's taxonomy in coursework as well as identifying best practices in questioning through virtual field experiences.

These changes will improve the student's ability to have a direct impact on the student's ability to apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 3
Course Map: EDUC 5410, EDUC 5420, EDUC 5430-PREP internship courses

- SLO 3 is assessed through a dispositions form during the PREP Internship semesters, which is a component of the certification requirement. Candidates will model professional behaviors and characteristics.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and Characteristics. (Dispositional Evaluation)	100% of candidates will score at least 4.0 on a 5 point scale as assessed through a professional dispositions form that measures behaviors and characteristics that are professional and ethical

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

Measure 3.1. (Direct-Dispositions)

SLO 3 is assessed through a professional dispositions form during the internship portion of the PREP program. Faculty created the dispositional evaluation based on agreed-upon best practices and constructs outlined in InTASC standards. Face validity established by 1) aligning items to constructs, 2) avoiding bias and ambiguous language, and 3) stating items in actionable terms. Analysis of the disposition forms was conducted using the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, resulting in "below sufficient," "sufficient," or "above sufficient" ratings.

Findings: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target met. 100% of candidates met target.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target met. 100% of candidates met target.
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target met. 100% of candidates met target.

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019 faculty provided more opportunities for live interaction with candidates through Webex to strengthen oral communication skills. Opportunities were also given for candidates to make revisions on assignments after feedback had been given by instructors thereby ensuring 100% of candidates met benchmark score of at least "sufficient". Of the dispositions evaluated, those that received the lowest mean score of 4.75 include:
- Is realistically self-assured
- Demonstrates passion/enthusiasm about teaching and learning
- Consistently exhibits attitude and uses language that indicates high expectation of growth and success for all learners
- Consistently responds to the needs of all learners.
- Responds to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies action when necessary.
- Uses appropriate tone of voice.
- Initiates communication to resolve conflict.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. In accordance with the plan of action from AC 2018-2019, in AC 2019-2020, the PREP faculty began planning for the inclusion of a videotaping assignment in which candidates will submit a video of themselves teaching a lesson for the purpose of evaluating these attributes. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to model professional behaviors and characteristics.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met, though data reported reflects data available for Fall 2019 only. In AC 2019-2020, data were not

available for Spring 2020 due to campus and school closures according to federal and state stay-at-home orders due to the coronavirus pandemic.

In AC 2019-2020, mean scores ranged from 4.0-4.8 on a 5-point scale.
The indicators that received the highest mean ratings of 4.8 were:
- Demonstrates passion/enthusiasm about teaching and learning
- Incorporates technology into professional work
- Uses appropriate professional and/or content standards, and continues to seek knowledge and professional development.

The indicators that received the lowest mean scores of 4.0 were:
- Is realistically self-assured, and competently handles demands of coursework and/or field experiences
- Communicates defectively, verbally and in written work
- Routinely models standard English in professional settings.

Decision, action or recommendation

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will add an ELA written proficiency test as a requirement for EDUC 5660 and EDUC 5680 to address the weaknesses indicated in the use of standard English. Faculty will provide review materials for candidates' use before completing the test. Faculty will provide feedback after the test is completed and additional opportunities for review and retesting are provided.

These changes will improve the student's ability to model professional behaviors and characteristics, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 4
Course Map:
- SLO 4 is an assessment of lesson planning effectiveness as evaluated through a rubric associated with the candidate's online portfolio during their Internship.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline	100% of candidates will design and implement developmentally appropriate lesson plans that reflect research on best practices.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

Measure 4.1 (Direct- Knowledge and Skills)
A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the lesson planning template to align with (at the time) new Louisiana Compass and Common Core State Standards' expectations. The template requires candidates to plan for and describe elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based.

A panel of 8 EPP faculty each conducted four independent rubric-based evaluations of anonymous lesson plan work samples submitted by candidates in four different initial teacher preparation programs. Analyses were conducted using the Lawshe Content Validity Ration (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.

- CVR mean = -.58 with CVR (Critical, 8) = .75 and 13 items (62%) meeting critical value of .75
- ICC = .573. ICC of .4 - .59 reflects "fair" inter-rater agreement, and .6 is considered "good."

Findings: Target was Not Met

- .
- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Not Met.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target Not Met**.**
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target Met

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was not met. In AC 2018-2019, lesson planning opportunities were incorporated into all PREP courses, with the opportunity for faculty feedback. Portfolio artifact evaluations of lesson planning included a more complete dataset which indicated a mean score of 3.0 among Elementary candidates, 2.55 among Secondary English candidates, 2.9 among Secondary Math candidates, and 3.2 among Secondary Science candidates for a mean score of 2.91 for all PREP candidates on a 4-point scale. This score is.09 below the target goal of 3.0. Specific indicators by which candidates were evaluated included their ability to create lesson plans that:
- Show depth of understanding and extensive application of content appropriate to teaching specialty
- Present clear and extensive evidence of instructional focus on critical thinking, problem-solving, decision making and/or responsibility taking.
- Include numerous and varied instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
- Include technology integrated into lesson, involves interaction by all learners, is appropriate to content, and supports instruction.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. The AY 2018-2019 score of slightly below the target of 3.0 indicates the need for additional support in lesson planning. As a result, program faculty included additional support, modeling, and individual feedback in candidates' lesson plans. Providing exemplary models of lesson plans, personalized feedback, and opportunities for revisions throughout Summer PREP course EDUC 5670 strengthened candidates' ability to plan for instruction. The result was for candidates to show more depth of understanding and extensive application of content, include varied instructional opportunities for diverse learners through the modeling and feedback practices. The component of integrating technology into lessons was included as a component of the comprehensive lesson plan. Candidates selected and included a technology-based resource that can be utilized by learners to support instruction. The technology component was evaluated for its potential for learners' interaction, appropriate content, and support of instruction. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met, though data reported reflects data available for Fall 2019 only. In AC 2019-2020, data were not available for Spring 2020 due to campus and school closures according to federal and state stay-at-home orders due to the coronavirus pandemic.

In AC 2019-2020, the limited data analysis indicates a mean score of 3.35 on a 4-point scale in the area of lesson planning for 4 out of 5 candidates. The mean score for elementary is 3.5, for middle school the mean score is 3.35, and for secondary 2.83. This secondary score is 0.17 below the benchmark score. This data indicates that additional support is needed for candidates in the secondary level.

Decision, action or recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was not met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will offer individual assistance and feedback to candidates regarding lesson planning. Individual needs vary among candidates for the specific type of support that is needed to strengthen lesson plan writing skills, so instructors will provide personalized instructional support in response to the academic needs for each candidate. Instructors will offer options for resources that include best teaching practices to all PREP candidates.

These changes will improve the student's ability to exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 5

Course Map: Internship of PREP program

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate (Student Learning Impact)	100% of candidates will score at least 80% on an assessment project to analyze student learning and provide evidence of using data for instructional decision-making

Measure 5.1. (Direct: Skills and Dispositions)

Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate.

SLO 5 is assessed through an assessment project in which candidates analyze student data in EDUC 5372/5382.

Finding: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Met
- **AY 2018-2019:** Target Not Met

Analysis.

In AC 2018-2019, the target was not met. In AC 2018-2019 80% of the candidates (8 out of 10) scored 80% or higher on this assessment. The area that showed the lowest mean score (16.4 out of 20 points) on the rubric is "*disaggregation of data and summary of results*" (INTASC Standards 1 & 2) Specific components within this indicator include a summary that addresses learning for the whole class as well as subgroups and individual students. References to student work samples that illustrate patterns of learning are also included.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty provided specific examples of student data and a summary of results as exemplar models of instruction in PREP courses. Faculty supported candidates to participate in efforts to identify subgroups within whole class data sets and determine patterns of learning through simulations. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met.

In AC 2019-2020 the mean score from all PREP candidates on the data analysis project is 91%, well above the target goal of 80%. The highest score is in the area of *Assessment & Evaluation Criteria- INTASC Standard 6.* The lowest scores as indicated on the rubric are in the areas of *Disaggregation of Data & Summary of Results-INTASC Standards 1 & 2 and Analysis of Student Learning-INTASC Standard 1,2,9.* The two weakest areas on this assignment include disaggregation of data and the summary of results and the analysis of student learning are connected. The rubric specifies the need for candidates to be able to be more specific in identifying the standards or skills in which their students need to improve. Candidates should be clearer in identifying specific data about sub-groups and individual student performance on the analysis of data assignment. The mean score on this assignment improved from 80% of students meeting the target goal to 100% of students meeting the target score. Comments posted on candidates' scoring rubrics indicate the need for improvement in disaggregating data and identifying specific needs of individuals and sub-groups.

Decision, action or recommendation

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will provide additional instructional resources to candidates in EDUC 5372/5382 in the form of videos and articles to support their understanding of data disaggregation and data interpretation based on scores from their students. Faculty will place instructional emphasis on ways in which to identify individual and sub-group data should be included in the course resources.

These changes will improve the student's ability to make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Seeking Improvement Based on Analysis of Results.

Program faculty made several decisions after examining results of data analysis from AC 2018-2019 which resulted in improved student learning and program improvement in AC 2019-2020.

- SLO 1: Faculty provided information found in the state and university Library systems to offer access to an online database, the Learning Express Library, as a preparation tool in order to fulfill the criteria of passing scores on the Praxis PLT.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

- SLO 2: Faculty modified course content in EDUC 5650/5670 as well as provided individual support by university supervisors during the internship. Instructors included virtual field experiences using videos. Instructors in EDUC 5370/5380 utilized WebEx in these online courses to discuss classroom management and learning styles as a Professional Learning Community.

- SLO 3: Faculty emphasized effective written communication skills through online coursework. Instructors included communication skills as a component of the scoring rubric on assignments. Specific feedback was given by course instructors and university supervisors to strengthen effective written communication skills.

- SLO 4: Faculty included additional support, modeling, and individual feedback in candidates' lesson plans. Faculty provided exemplary models of lesson plans, personalized feedback, and opportunities for revisions throughout Summer PREP course EDUC 5670 to strengthen candidates' ability to plan for instruction.

- SLO 5: Faculty added an assessment project to EDUC 5372/5382 PREP class which is completed during the final semester of the program. The project provides candidates with real world experience in data analysis and data-driven decision making that relates to their current SLT's.

- SLO 5: Faculty provided specific examples of student data and a summary of results as exemplar models of instruction in PREP courses. Faculty supported candidates to participate in efforts to identify subgroups within whole class data sets and determine patterns of learning through simulations

- Faculty added Webex experiences to extend opportunities for instructor/students interactions since all PREP coursework is online.

- Faculty placed a greater emphasis on improving candidates' written communication skills in class assignments through feedback and specific rubric indicators.

Plan of Action Moving Forward.

Program faculty have examined the evidence and results of data analysis from AC 2019-2020 and will take steps to continue to improve student learning in AC 2020-2021:

- SLO 1: Instructors for the PREP courses in the summer semester (EDUC 5650/5670, EDUC 5660/5680, and EPSY 5480) will provide candidates with specific information regarding the concepts testing on the PLT through the document published by ETS/Praxis, *The Study Companion*. This resource includes: an overview of the test, a template study plan, study topics,

practice questions and explanations of correct answers and links to detailed information related to the test. Instructors will provide candidates with information regarding the Learning Express Library resource for individual use in preparing for the PLT in their area.

- SLO 2: Teachers in the PREP program for elementary candidates should focus on ways to enhance students' knowledge of managing classroom procedures through modeling examples in virtual field experiences. The area of using questioning and discussion techniques should be a focus for candidates in the Middle/Secondary levels. This can be achieved with added emphasis on application of Bloom's taxonomy in coursework as well as identifying best practices in questioning through virtual field experiences.

- SLO 3: Faculty will add an ELA written proficiency test has been added as a requirement for EDUC 5660 and EDUC 5680 to address the weaknesses indicated in the use of standard English. Faculty will provide review materials for candidates' use before completing the test. Faculty will provide feedback after the test is completed and additional opportunities for review and retesting are provided.

- SLO 4: Faculty will offer individual assistance and feedback to candidates regarding lesson planning. Individual needs vary among candidates for the specific type of support that is needed to strengthen lesson plan writing skills, so instructors will provide personalized instructional support in response to the academic needs for each candidate. Instructors will offer options for resources that include best teaching practices to all PREP candidates.

- SLO 5: Faculty will provide additional instructional resources to candidates in EDUC 5372/5382 in the form of videos and articles to support their understanding of data disaggregation and data interpretation based on scores from their students. Faculty will place instructional emphasis on ways in which to identify individual and sub-group data should be included in the course resources.